

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/744,169	JEARY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Susan T. Tran	1618	

**All Participants:**

(1) Susan T. Tran.

(2) Peter Mlynek.
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 23 January 2008
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: to place this application in condition for allowance, it was suggested to: 1) incorporate the release profiles of claim 23 into independent claims 47 and 57; 2) cancel claims 1, 33, 59; and 3) correct dependencies of claims that depending in the cancelled claims. Further, claim 72 is deleted because the subject matter in this claim is the same with claim 23, and therefore, will be redundant. The following is the reason for this amendment: claims 1, 33 and 59 recited only one particle population, which does not result in a release profiles recited in dependent claims. Table 7 disclosed a release rates of one particle population which does not show release rates of between 20% and 75% after 2 hours. However, Table 10 clearly showed that the release profiles recited in the claims are obtained from formulations comprising two populations of particles as recited in claims 47 and 57. Applicant's attorney instead preferred to cancel claims 1, 33, 59 and all claims that depend therein. The Examiner's Amendment was authorized.